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Calls for interethnic violence in Rwanda have been over a hundred years in the making. From 1899 to 1918, Germany administered Rwanda from Berlin, and after the First World War, Rwanda was transferred to Belgian control. Both Germany and Belgium “relied on an elite essentially composed of people who referred to themselves as Tutsi.”\(^\text{73}\) This choice was born of racial or even racist considerations. “In the minds of the colonizers, the Tutsi looked more like them, because of their height and colour, and were, therefore, more intelligent and better equipped to govern.”\(^\text{74}\) It was in the 1930s that Belgian authorities concretized this Hutu-Tutsi dichotomy by establishing each group as an ethnic group. To enforce this, it became mandatory for every Rwandan to bear an identity card which indicated his or her ‘ethnicity.’\(^\text{75}\)

In 1957 the Hutus issued a manifesto calling for a change in Rwanda’s power structure. As a result, Hutu political parties were formed to give them a voice commensurate with their

---


\(^{74}\) Ibid.
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numbers. In 1959 tens of thousands of Tutsis were killed or forced into exile. Years later, members of the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), comprised of Tutsi refugees living in Uganda, invaded Rwanda. This led to the promulgation of a new multi-party constitution. In 1993, the Rwandan government signed a power-sharing agreement with the RPF called the Arusha Accords, signalling the end of civil war. Unfortunately President Habyarimana, a Hutu, was killed in April 1994 after his plane was shot down over Kigali. This signalled the beginning of the genocide that claimed approximately one million lives.

On June 15, 2005, Rwandan popular folk musician Simon Bikindi was indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. His charges: “conspiracy to commit genocide; genocide, or alternatively complicity in genocide; direct and public incitement to commit genocide, and murder and persecution, as crimes against humanity.” Bikindi’s indictment for composing music that is said to have supported the hatred of the Tutsi people, leading to their massacre in 1994, has inspired much controversy regarding where the line should be drawn between freedom of speech and incitement to gross human rights violations. As Professor Anton Harber, director of the journalism and media studies programme at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg has argued, “Although a message on radio or television cannot in itself cause murder or genocide, it can feed into a situation that creates the conditions to commit

---

Bikindi’s music was an important component in the genocide plan because it encouraged ethnic hatred against the Tutsis; it “urged people to attack the Tutsis and kill them because of their ethnic background.” Given the correct social and political environment, music and musicians are capable of inciting genocide. Musicians therefore have responsibility for their already created work, as changing social environments, not original intention, are what create meaning within a musical work.

Simon Bikindi was a well-known, albeit controversial, artist in Rwanda who often used politics as a source of inspiration for his music. In 2005, the ICTR indicted Bikindi on six counts for crimes perpetrated in 1994, including one count of direct and public incitement to commit genocide. According to *Prosecutor v. Bikindi*, Case No. ICTR-01-72-T, Amended Indictment, 31-41, “The incitement charge was based on the playing and dissemination of Bikindi’s extremist Hutu songs…and his speeches exhorting extremist Hutu party activists and militia to exterminate the Tutsi population.” Stephen Rapp, head of prosecutions at the ICTR, argued that “[t]hrough his music, [Bikindi] contributed to a campaign to spread hatred,” leading to the eventual genocide in 1994. Rapp claimed that “Bikindi’s music was an essential component in the genocide...
plan since it incited ethnic hatred against the Tutsis and urged people to attack the Tutsis and kill them because of their ethnic background.”

In his defense Bikindi’s lead counsel, Wilfred Detritus, argues that “[t]o accuse Bikindi is to condemn the right to freedom of expression.” The defence concluded that “Bikindi was only doing his citizen’s duty. The country had been invaded and as a good patriot, Bikindi urged people to mobilize against the invaders.” This argument fails to account for the identity of ‘the invaders’, an identity which changes over time as social and political environments change.

Through his initial role as a musician and composer, Simon Bikindi became an influential political force. He was a member of President Juvénal Habyarimana’s Mouvement républicain national pour la démocratie et le développement political party (MRND), and was later Habyarimana’s eulogist following his assassination in April 1994. According to the charge sheet, Bikindi, in the prelude to the genocide, worked closely with Habyarimana and other government and military leadership to plan the execution of Tutsis. Besides these obvious political ties, Bikindi was also one of the founders of Radio Télévision Libre des Milles Collines. The RTLM was an extremist Hutu radio station that broadcasted Tutsi hate rhetoric and calls for violence during the genocide. According to Bikindi’s indictment, “[a]ppeals on RTLM to attack the enemy were often preceded or followed by songs written and performed by Simon Bikindi,” who did nothing to prevent this
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misuse of his music even though Rwandan copyright laws gave him the right to do so.

Bikindi was very active in Rwandan cultural life. Outside of his own musical work he was the director of the *Irindiro Ballet*, a company renowned for its blend of traditional music and dance. “Succumbing to the mobilizing effects of his music, members of the ballet were recruited into the *Interahamwe* militia, underwent military training and went on to kill Tutsis.”<sup>86</sup> Leading up to the genocide, Bikindi is said to have “used his lyrics to incite supporters to join the *Interahamwe* militia and commit such crimes.”<sup>87</sup> Bikindi was an active recruiter and mobilizer of militia members at the grassroots level. Through his popularity Bikindi exercised a large amount of political influence. His status in the community provided him with the privilege and responsibility of having the public’s ear, one that he manipulated for the purpose of mass murder.

In 2008 Simon Bikindi was sentenced to fifteen years in prison for using a public address system to incite the killing of ethnic Tutsis. Eye-witness accounts informed the tribunal that “during his outbound travel to Kivumu, Bikindi, riding in a truck with a loudspeaker, addressed himself to the militias doing the killing.”<sup>88</sup> He is reported to have said: “You sons of *Sebahinzi*, who are the majority, I am speaking to you, you know that the Tutsi are minority. Rise up and look everywhere possible and do not spare anybody.”<sup>89</sup> Another witness testified that on Bikindi’s return trip from Kayove he heard Bikindi ask over a truck

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.
<sup>87</sup> “Rwandan singer accused of using music to incite genocide goes on trial at UN tribunal,” *UN News Service*, September 18, 2006.
<sup>89</sup> Ibid. 268.
loudspeaker “[h]ave you killed the Tutsis here?”

“He also heard Bikindi’s songs being played as the vehicles moved on.”

According to *Prosecutor v. Bikindi*, Case No. ICTR-01-72-T, Judgment and Sentence, 268. Bikindi’s statements through loudspeakers constitute direct and public incitement to commit genocide. While his statements were explicit, it is imperceptive to think that his choice to play his music through the same speakers was not. The tribunal’s decision to acquit Bikindi for his musical actions was irresponsible. Bikindi is a public address system – he is a popular musician. Throughout his career, Bikindi abused his growing popularity in order to convey a political, pro-Hutu message.

The prosecution examined two songs. The first, “Twasezereye ingoma ya cyami” (We Said Goodbye to the Feudal Regime), was first performed in 1987 at the time of Rwanda’s 25th anniversary of independence. The lyrics verbally assault the monarchy reversed in 1959 and celebrate the end of feudalism and colonization. Bikindi defends himself by stating: “To denounce the bad practices of feudal monarchy is not synonymous to hate Tutsis.” Regarded like this it seems more reasonable to attribute to the song the status of social commentary – albeit of a divisive nature – than of a call to genocide. However this particular song “was later recorded in a studio in 1993 as part of an album” and co-opted to focus popular dissent against the peace plan being developed in Arusha, Tanzania at the end of the Rwandan Civil War in 1993.

At this point, ‘Twasezereye’, like several of Bikindi’s songs,

---
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turned “from simple hate speech to a demonstrable element of a consciously deployed call to genocide.”

According to the prosecution, the piece characterizes Tutsis “[as] Hutu enslavers, enemies or enemy accomplices…by continuously making references to the 1959 Revolution and its gains by the rubanda ngamwinsi [Hutu]…and inciting ethnic hatred and people to attack and kill Tutsi.”

Upon analysis of the lyrics, it is not difficult to designate the piece, when it was originally written, as “pro-Hutu” and thus, during the climate leading up to April 1994, “anti-Tutsi”.

Because of the change in the societal climate from 1987, when “Twasezereye ingoma ya cyami” was written, to the years leading up to the genocide, it is pertinent to re-evaluate the meanings of several phrases of the lyrics. The line “Serving the master without remuneration” heard in the context of 1993 could refer to colonial rule or, more contemporaneously, to the Tutsi elite. In the chorus Bikindi writes of “The feudal and colonial yokes”. The “colonial yokes” refer to the Germans and Belgians, and very likely the “feudal” yokes refer to the Tutsi who were the appointed monarchy during German and Belgian rule. The second verse is easily interpreted as inspiring despair and remembrance for the suffering of the Hutu. In the verses that follow Bikindi also mentions three influential, pro-Hutu politicians. Dominique Mbonyumutwa was the first provisional president of Rwanda immediately following the abolition of the Rwandan monarchy. He was of Hutu ethnicity. Mbonyumutwa was significant to Bikindi and his views because he was the first president of an independent Rwanda. The second icon

97 The lyrics to the first half of “Twasezereye Ingoma ya Cyami” are given in *Appendix A* (page 12-13).
mentioned is Grégoire Kayibanda, the first elected president of the Republic of Rwanda. He was also an ethnic Hutu and replaced the Tutsi monarchy with a republican form of government. Kayibanda asserted Hutu majority power by founding the political party Parmehutu (Parti du Mouvement de l’Emancipation Hutu, “Hutu Emancipation Movement Party”), which quickly became militarized. During his presidency Kayibanda and the Parmehutu published the “Hutu Manifesto” (1957). The manifesto alleged that the Tutsi minority still held a monopoly of power in Rwanda. The last Hutu to which Bikindi makes reference is Juvénal Habyarimana, president of the Republic of Rwanda from 1973 until his assassination in 1994. Habyarimana favoured the Hutus and supported the Hutu majority in neighbouring Burundi against the Tutsi government. Habyarimana was killed on April 6, 1994, when his airplane was shot down close to Kigali International Airport. His assassination ignited ethnic tensions, leading to the Rwandan Genocide of 1994.

The second of Bikindi’s songs that deserves more scrutiny is one entitled “Njyewe nanga Abahutu” or “I Hate These Hutu”. It is not far-fetched to conclude that “Njyewe nanga Abahutu” is a song against moderate Hutus; as Martin Cloonan, professor of Popular Music Politics at the University of Glasgow writes, “it is not only anti-Tutsi, but also anti-coexistence.” In this song Bikindi uses certain ‘buzz words’ to gain support and inspire a reaction from the listener. He refers to the moderate Hutu as “arrogant”, a word that has monarchical undertones and could imply that the moderate Hutus are more like the Tutsi than they are like the Hutu. Addressing the listener

---
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as “comrade” encourages unity against an enemy – the moderate Hutu. Bikindi refers to the “de-Hutuized Hutu” as a species, implying that they are sub-humans who do not deserve to be treated as equals. De-humanizing the enemy has always been a tactic used in war. Bikindi’s lyrics go on to mention “Joining a war whose cause they ignore,” most likely referring to the Tutsi RPF’s invasion of Rwanda in 1990 in order to “overthrow [President] Habyarimana and secure their right to return to their homeland.”

Two meanings can be derived from this line of text: either the moderate Hutu are a part of the war because they are one of two ethnic sides, but they have no interest in fighting (“…whose cause they ignore”), or they are seen as supporting the RPF and ignoring the fact that the RPF also has militaristic endeavours aimed at the majority – the Hutu. In this case Bikindi’s music was used to incite hatred for any Hutu who were believed to support the RPF – the moderate Hutu.

Following the trial Bikindi was convicted of “direct and public incitement to commit genocide for exhorting Hutu militia on a bullhorn to attack Tutsi civilians,” while the charges pertaining to his pop songs were absolved. The ICTR ruled that Bikindi’s songs “advocated Hutu unity against a common foe and incited ethnic hatred” and that they were “deployed in a propaganda campaign in 1994 in Rwanda to incite people to

attack and kill Tutsi.” However, the tribunal found insufficient evidence to conclude “that Bikindi composed these songs with the specific intention to incite such attacks and killings, even if they were used to that effect in 1994.” Regardless of intention, Bikindi’s songs were used to that effect. He was still living while his music was being manipulated for the cause – he had the authority and the responsibility to prevent his music from being used this way. Bikindi could have disallowed the use of his music to spread anti-Tutsi propaganda, but he did not.

“While there is no doubt that his songs fed into the general hysteria that fuelled the genocide, it may be difficult to prove a causal link between his songs and the genocide…. Songs, by their very nature, are metaphorical,” argues Jane Duncan, executive director of the Johannesburg-based Freedom of Expression Institute. ICTR’s prosecution had accused Bikindi of composing music aimed at encouraging genocide. The judgment found no proof of this, or of encouraging radio stations to play his songs. Regarding content, the Trial Chamber focused on two criteria through which speech content regarding race or ethnicity could be classified as either legitimate expression or criminal advocacy: its purpose and its context. The purpose of the speech content could range from “clearly legitimate purposes, such as historical research and dissemination of news, to patently

criminal purposes such as explicit calls for violence.”106 The exploration of context considers circumstances surrounding the speaker’s text, “such as contemporaneous large-scale interethnic violence, as well as the speaker’s tone of voice.”107

Bikindi wrote these songs long before they were disseminated during the genocide. The Tribunal noted that Bikindi could not have had the requisite genocidal intent. However, the songs’ dissemination in relation to the violence at the time of the genocide cannot be ignored. A witness, a former member of the Interahamwe, said that “although Bikindi’s songs were full of allusions their meaning was clear to any Rwandan – Tutsis should be slaughtered.”108 The context in which the pieces were written is irrelevant. As contexts change, meanings change. Music becomes its own entity, divorced from the intentions of the musician.

Intention for a piece of music in its conception becomes irrelevant once it plays a role in a significant social or political event – especially a negative event. The ICTR Appeals Chamber remarked,

On the issue of determining the offender’s specific intent, the Chamber considers that the intent is a mental factor which is difficult, event impossible, to determine…The Chamber considers that it is possible to deduce the genocidal intent inherent in a particular act changed from the general context of the perpetration of other culpable acts systematically

107 Ibid., 1022.
directed against that same group, whether these acts were committed by the same offender or by others. Other factors, such as the scale of atrocities committed, their general nature in a region or a country, or furthermore, the fact of deliberately and systematically targeting victims on account of their membership of a particular group, while excluding the members of other groups, can enable the Chamber to infer the genocidal intent of a particular act.109

The requisite intent of genocide is to destroy a group ‘in whole or in part’. Given the overwhelming scale of the anti-Tutsi extermination campaign in Rwanda, “there is little room for ambiguity as to whether this requirement is satisfied.”110 A direct appeal to genocide may be implicit, but could nonetheless constitute direct and public incitement to commit genocide when disseminated in a particular context. In Bikindi’s case, his intentions were implied by the fact that he did not act when his music was being used to spread anti-Tutsi propaganda.

There are free-speech implications of criminalizing artistic expression in a genocidal context. John Floyd, the Media Case attorney for the director and editor of a Rwandan newspaper who was charged with similar crimes argues that Bikindi’s indictment could lead to a backlash against musicians who arguably support one ethnic, political, or social group over another. As attorney Robert H. Snyder has noted, “Considering that Bikindi’s songs are characterized by the prosecution as only songs of Hutu solidarity and not direct calls for the killing of

Tutsis, a large range of music could be affected.”

Through investigations like these there is also a potential for strengthening freedom of expression. Bikindi’s writing and performance of this music was not the criminal act. In this case, the songs were considered criminal when they were considered in relation to extramusical events. It was the message of the songs, combined with “their presentation amidst calls for outright genocide on the airwaves of RTLM and at gatherings of the Interahamwe that made Bikindi’s music so deadly.”

The government used the power and influence of Bikindi’s popular, nationalistic folk tunes as a tool to incite hatred between ethnic groups – a hatred that ultimately led to a 100-day massacre of the Tutsi minority. A piece of music cannot be judged solely on its content, heard within the original context in which it was created – especially if the lyricist is still alive and able to control where, when and in what contexts his music is performed. Simon Bikindi not only expressed his anti-Tutsi views outside of his music, he also used his music as a means to further express these views. In this way Bikindi abused his status as a composer – and having the public’s ear – to impose his personal views on the people of Rwanda. Bikindi could have easily prevented his compositions – filled with hate rhetoric – from being used to fan the flames of hatred amongst the Hutu and Tutsi people. Listeners are vulnerable and prone to music’s influence – especially during times of political and social tension. Once a societal atmosphere becomes altered from the context in
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which a piece was created, initial compositional intent becomes irrelevant. While freedom of expression is a human right, when it infringes on the well-being of others, musicians should be required to take responsibility for their music and what it inspires in others.
Eeeee!
Remember the whip and the chore!
Remember the days you spent
Serving the master without remuneration
And therefore rejoice of Independence!

Chorus:
We said goodbye to the monarchy
The feudal and colonial yokes disappeared at the same time
And we got the democracy that suits us.
Come and let us celebrate the independence.

Remember the days of walking,
The many nights that you spent in difficult conditions,
Carrying tribute to the home of the head or the royal court,
At the expense of your family who had needed you
And when, exhausted, you arrive at your destination,
We were not even appreciated.
Come, let us celebrate the independence.

[Chorus]

I am very young and I did not know it
I was told and I’ve learned through reading
And when I preserved the death penalty;
It is for this reason that I look forward to independence.

[Chorus]

I pay a heartfelt tribute
Activists who were released,
Which Kayibanda in mind,
I am thinking especially Mbonyumutwa
And their valiant companions.
What we need is independence.
[Chorus]

It is said that of the many souls born
The point is the number of years.
At that time Habyarimana
Was at the head of the army.
It enjoyed peace since its birth
And always fights for that peace.
We congratulate you, proud young soldiers.
May you continue to lead the army valiantly.\(^{113}\)

---

Appendix B
“Miyewe nanga Abahutu” (I Hate These Hutu) lyrics

I hate these Hutu, these arrogant Hutu, braggarts,
Who scorn other Hutu, dear comrades!
I hate these Hutus, these de-Hutuized Hutus,
Who have disowned their identity, dear comrades!
I hate these Hutu, these Hutu who march blindly, like imbeciles,
This species of naïve Hutu who are manipulated, and who tear themselves up,
Joining in a war whose cause they ignore.
I detest these Hutu who are brought to kill – to kill, I swear to you,
And who kill the Hutu, dear comrades.
If I hate them, so much the better...

Let us start in the region of Butare,
Where they like living under feudalism –
Who would blame me for that?
I hate them and I don’t apologize for that.
Lucky for us that they are few in number…\footnote{114}

\footnote{114} “Rwanda File: Primary sources from the Rwandan Genocide,”
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